

Security and sanctions

STATINTL

A vigorous debate is underway over one of the United States' serious national security problems: the lack of a coherent, agreed-upon policy on the use of strict trade controls to punish foreign enemies for international crimes and to prevent the acquisition of Western technology by the Soviet bloc.

The House and Senate have resumed their fight over a compromise rewriting of the Export Administration Act, which President Reagan was compelled to extend beyond its March 31 expiration because of lack of congressional agreement on a replacement. Without such a law, foreign nations would have unlimited access to American technology and data. The U.S. is also putting pressure on its NATO allies and Japan to put export controls on computer software to keep it away from the Eastern bloc at all costs.

In an ancillary struggle, the Pentagon and the commerce department are fighting over jurisdiction concerning trade controls. The U.S. government halted the overseas shipment of some \$104 million in strategically valuable American goods last year, a mere two-tenths of one percent of all exports. The defense department, which wants the dominant role in export control, thinks controls should be much more stringent and that the scientific community should be prevented from making sensitive research data public. In retaining principal jurisdiction, the Commerce Department wants to balance strategic concerns with economic ones, especially because the United States is running up a huge trade deficit.

The need for action is imperative, but it must be tempered with a heavy dose of reality. Adm. Bobby Ray Inman, former director of the high-tech National Security Agency and deputy director of the CIA, is among many who believe that, though it's possible to slow the flow of

Trade as a weapon

Western technology to the Soviets, there's no practical means of stopping it—certainly not when American armed forces in Europe are using easily accessible, off-the-shelf Apple computers to target nuclear weapons.

The answer—as Adm. Inman is pursuing as leader of the U.S. "supercomputer" race against the Japanese—lies in doing more to keep ahead and making use of technology developments faster. In 1971, Soviet computer hardware was 10 years behind the U.S. By 1981, it was just two years behind—not simply because of successful espionage but because its totalitarian system allowed it to get new technology on line much more quickly.

Our NATO allies have made it clear they don't want U.S. trade laws applied unilaterally to their territories, particularly when neutral European countries such as Austria and Sweden can pursue technology all they wish no matter how accessible it becomes to the Soviets.

A U.S. export sanction on computer technology is not going to be worth very much if it is so excessive it produces discord rather than unity among the allies and inhibits our own technology development by suppressing the exchange of information in the scientific community and denying American firms the competitive drive of the world market.

First and foremost, the U.S. must make sure that it continues to produce technology worth stealing.

STATINTL

Inman warns of Soviet scare tactics

By RALPH WININGHAM
MILITARY REPORTER

The Soviets soon will begin a massive effort to scare Americans into believing the world is edging closer to nuclear holocaust, a former CIA official said Wednesday.

"In the next six to eight months, we are going to see the Soviets trying to whip up hysteria," retired Admiral Bobby R. Inman told the *Express* in an exclusive interview before his address to the Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club.

"I am sure they will try to make the issue as scary as possible," he added. "But if you ask me if nuclear confrontation is certain, I'd say, 'No.'

The possibility of a standing-start nuclear war is not a threat. It is far more likely the Soviets will use their mobile, conventional forces to become involved in more Third World conflicts."

Inman, a former deputy director of the Central Intelligence Agency, said the Soviets, through scare tactics, will try to affect the outcome of November's presidential election.

While he would not commit himself to any presidential candidate, In-

man did say he is comfortable with President Reagan's military stance.

"His support of the military has been unwavering," he said.

In his address to more than 500 civilian and military leaders at the Armed Forces Week luncheon in El Tropicano's Coronado Ballroom, Inman said he is convinced the United States must rebuild a consensus on national security.

"A consensus on national security came out after World War II, but it was one of the casualties of the 1960s," he said. "This security should include diplomacy, foreign aid, international trade, arms control and other elements.

"We need to sustain our national security at an affordable rate."

National security, however, includes confronting the exportation of terrorism and revolution by Cuban President Fidel Castro, Inman said.

"The potential for exportation of

revolution is a fact of life," he said. "It is one we must find new ways to deal with."

Inman told the *Express* that the Grenada invasion is a good example of dealing head-on with exported revolution, even though he pointed out military force should not be the only option.

"We did it large, we did it fast, and we got out fast," he said. "This country does not support long, open-ended commitments."

Armed Forces Week activities will continue Thursday with an Alamo Kiwanis Club luncheon in the Pearl Brewery's Jersey Lilly Room to honor members of the National Guard and Reserves.

Featured speaker at the noon event will be Arthur G. Hansen, chancellor of Texas A&M University and state chairman of the committee for employer support of the guard and reserve.